

Message

From: Morris, Jennifer [Morris.Jennifer@epa.gov]
Sent: 12/10/2020 6:43:29 PM
To: Kennedy, Deborah [Kennedy.Deborah@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: ACRES data needed for 605 E Maple St, Former Clinton Engines, Maquoketa, IA

Flag: Follow up

I think the TBA Acreage is bigger because they have to go off site and the Clinton engines site is defined in ACRES according to the boundary of the old facility (and the definition of the registration on the IDNR Land Stewardship program). Perhaps the added parcel number is that additional area where the network of wells will go extending beyond the facility boundary. (yet another policy question for Lisa which I know we have hashed but one she has not been party to)

As far as the 0 dollars being there I am a bit confused. I think that must have happenened with the work package that backed out a lot of work and replaced it with other work. So now I need to confirm if those should even be there. If they were marked for deletion shouldn't they have gone and not just been zeroed out?

I do think I actually kept PDFs of that work package (I know hard to believe) so I will check.

From: Kennedy, Deborah <Kennedy.Deborah@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, December 10, 2020 12:12 PM
To: Morris, Jennifer <Morris.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: ACRES data needed for 605 E Maple St, Former Clinton Engines, Maquoketa, IA

Jennifer—As we talk about the new TBA application Maquoketa submitted to Lisa, vs. the grant funding already expended by ECIA on the Clinton Engines portion of the property being defined in the TBA application (Clinton Engines + now-segregated museum parcel) (or maybe this should be clarified in the TBA application as two properties now), I checked back on the ACRES data ECIA entered for some version of the property and had the following concerns.

Per the attached property record, four Supplemental Assessments have been reported, with overlapping dates. The Supplementals can obviously be for distinct assessment activities (details of which unfortunately don't display in the property record), and are somewhat supported by the wide-ranging associated funding expended. However it might be worth verifying that four distinct assessment activities were conducted, at the times reported. And ECIA needs to report the funding associated with the 08/08/2019 - 03/01/2020 Supplemental Assessment (currently showing \$0).

Also, ECIA needs to report the funding expended for the 06/21/2018 - 12/03/2018 Cleanup Planning activity (currently showing \$0).

I also mentioned on the call this morning that the acreage was nearly the same on the TBA application (to include the Clinton Engines and museum properties—3 parcels) as the one Clinton Engines property (2 parcels) currently in ACRES, but the TBA acreage is bigger and it could be that the museum property/parcel is only 0.34 acres (i.e., 10.86 - 10.52), which would be logical if you can verify that.

Deb
EPA R7 Brownfield Project Manager/Data Coordinator
913-551-7628